arXiv:1511.00818v1 [physics.bio-ph] 3 Nov 2015

A physical description of the adhesion and aggregation of platelets

Bastien Chopard[1],* Daniel Ribeiro de Sousa[2], Jonas Latt[1], Frank Dubois[3], Catherine Yourassowsky[3], Pierre Van Antwerpen[4], Omer Eker[5], Luc Vanhamme[6], David Perez-Morga[5], Guy Courbebaisse[7], and Karim Zouaoui Boudjeltia[2]

[1]*Computer Science Department, University of Geneva, Switzerland*
[2]*Laboratory of Experimental Medicine, Universit Libre de Bruxelles (ULB) and CHU de Charleroi, Belgium*
[3]*Microgravity Research Centre, Université libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Belgium*
[4]*Laboratory of Pharmaceutical Chemistry and Analytic Platform of the Faculty of Pharmacy, Université libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Belgium*
[5]*Department of Interventional Neuroradiology, CHRU de Montpellier, France*
[6]*Institute of Molecular Biology and Medicine, Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Belgium and*
[7]*CREATIS, INSA Lyon, University of Lyon, France*

The early stages of clot formation in blood vessels involve platelets adhesion-aggregation. Although these mechanisms have been extensively studied, gaps in their understanding still persist. We have performed detailed *in-vitro* experiments and developed a numerical model to better describe and understand this phenomenon. Unlike previous studies, we took into account both activated and non-activated platelets, as well as the 3D nature of the aggregation process. Our investigation reveals that blood albumin is a major parameter limiting platelet adhesion and aggregation. Our results also show that the well accepted Zydney-Colton shear-induced diffusivity is much too low to explain the observed deposition rate. Simulations are in very good agreement with observations and provide quantitative estimates of the adhesion and aggregation rates that are hard to measure experimentally.

PACS numbers: 87.10.-e,87.17.Aa,87.18.Ed,87.18.Vf

Despite their critical importance in clinical practice and physiology, the mechanisms by which hemodynamic conditions lead to platelets adhesion (process by which individual platelets bind to a vessel wall) and aggregation (process by which platelets attach to each other) are still incompletely understood. The current understanding is that at low shear rate ($0 \rightarrow 1000\ s^{-1}$) platelet aggregation is primarily mediated by soluble fibrinogen, which physically crosslinks platelets through engagement of integrin αIIbβ3. At progressively higher shear rate [1, 2] ($1000 \rightarrow 10000\ s^{-1}$) aggregation becomes increasingly driven by the von Willebrand Factor through its ability to rapidly engage glycoprotein Ib, with fibrinogen playing a supportive role in stabilizing aggregates. However, the parameters that limit the platelet adhesion and aggregation in space and time have not been clearly identified [3]. A quantitative 3D model of adhesion and aggregation will reveal the respective importance of the various mechanisms at play, thus offering the possibility to control the platelets behavior in patients with cardiovascular risk factors with a proper dosage of pharmacological agents.

We investigated this question with *in-vitro* experiments, using the platelets function analyzer Impact-R [4]. The Impact-R is a cylindrical device whose lower end is a fixed disk, serving as a deposition surface, with a total area $S = 132.7\ mm^2$. It is covered with polystyrene, on which platelets adhere and aggregate, but other coating can easily be considered. The upper end of the Impact-R cylinder is a rotating disk. Both disks are aligned with the xy-plane. Anticoagulated (citrate) samples of whole blood were loaded between these two disks, separated by $L = 0.82\ mm$. Due to the rotation of the upper disk, the blood is subject to a laminar flow. A controlled shear rate at the wall $\dot{\gamma}$ is created in a given observation window of $1 \times 1\ mm^2$, on the deposition surface. We imposed $\dot{\gamma} = 100\ s^{-1}$, corresponding to a value where the platelet deposition reaches its maximum in a range of $0 - 5000\ s^{-1}$ [5].



FIG. 1. *Left:* platelet deposition as observed on the Impact-R $1mm \times 1mm$ deposition window, after 300s. *Right:* Result of the numerical simulation, obtained with the parameters of table I.

The experiment was repeated for 7 healthy donors. For each of them, we measured on the observation window, the formation of clusters resulting from deposition and aggregation of platelets, see Fig. 1 left. The number of clusters and their size, as well as the number of activated platelets and non-activated platelets still in suspension were measured at 20 s, 60 s, 120 s and 300 s. For each of these times a new experiment had to be performed,



FIG. 2. Left, Scan Electron Microscopy of platelet aggregates in the well. Right, the 3D shape of a platelets aggregate based on the optical height obtained by digital holographic microscopy (DHM). The vertical scale bar unit is $5.2nm$ and the field of view $12.8\mu m \times 12.8\mu m$.

since the measurement requires the interruption of the depositon process.

Our goal is to explain the observed time evolution of the above quantities as a function of the parameters of the system. Numerous mathematical models have been proposed in the literature to describe the adhesion of platelets on a surface. See for instance [6, 7] and reference therein. All the models assume that platelets reach the deposition surface due to a shear induced diffusion. The other parts of the proposed models depend very much on the specific question addressed by the authors, and the experimental device they have considered to produce their observations (often assuming a steady state, which is not the case here). Our first attempts to model the Impact-R experiments convinced us that the current knowledge is not sufficient to explain what is observed. Therefore we developed an improved model that addresses the two most unexpected features: (i) the well accepted Zydney-Colton model for shear-induced diffusion is much too small to explain the observed depletion rate of platelets from the suspension; (ii) there is a mechanism that quickly limits the platelets deposition: during the first 60 s there is a rapid increase of the number of clusters but, at 300 s, there are still a lot of platelets in suspension but neither formation of new clusters nor an increase of their surface.

To explain the slowdown of the increase of the cluster areas, we first assumed it might be due to a dominant growth in the 3rd dimension (z-axis). Using a digital holographic microscope, we were able to study the development of the aggregates thickness [8], a quantity never measured before to our knowledge. See fig. 2. However, the 3D nature of the aggregate was not sufficient to explain the saturation of the areas of the clusters. We performed new experiments [5] that revealed that blood albumin is the main factor limiting adhesion and aggregation, as it competes with platelets for deposition.

To account for the above observation, we propose the following scenario: (i) activated platelets (AP) adhere to the deposition surface, thus forming a seed for a new cluster. (ii) non-activated platelets (NAP) and AP can deposit at the periphery, or on top, of an existing cluster. This is the aggregation mechanism that makes the cluster grow. (iii) Albumin (Al) also deposits on the surface, thus reducing locally the adhesion and aggregation rates of platelets.

The numerical model that we propose to describe and validate the above process is the following. The substrate S is aligned with the xy-plane and the blood layer expands along the z-axis. We consider three types of particles: the AP, NAP, and Al. Any of them can be either in suspension in the blood layer, or deposited on S. We consider a mixed particle-density representation: particles in suspension are described by a density field but as individual entities when they deposit. The blood layer has thickness $L = 0.82\ mm$ and is subject to a constant shear rate $\dot{\gamma} = 100\ s^{-1}$. This shear induces a diffusion of the platelets and the albumin towards the substrate.

The deposition substrate S is discretized as $n \times n$ square cells of area $\Delta S = 5\ (\mu m)^2$, corresponding to the size of a deposited platelet (obtained as the smallest variation of cluster area observed with the microscope). The number n is chosen as $1000\ \mu m/\sqrt{5\ (\mu m)^2} = 447$ so that the total area of the substrate is $S = 1\ mm \times 1\ mm$, as in the experiment.

Assuming a good horizontal mixing in the $xy - plane$ due to the rotating flow, we consider that the densities of AP, NAP and Al only vary along the z-axis and will be described by three 1D diffusion systems: $\partial_t \rho = D\partial_z^2 \rho$ where ρ can be the density of AP, NAP or Al. The initial condition is constant along z, $\rho(z) = \rho_0$, determined by the experimental measurement, namely 172,200 $(\mu l)^{-1}$ for NAP, 4808 $(\mu l)^{-1}$ for AP, and 2.69×10^{13} $(\mu l)^{-1}$ for the Al. The boundary conditions are (i) $J(L,t) = 0$ at any time at the top of the blood layer, where $J = -D\text{grad}\rho$ is the flux of particles and D the shear induced diffusion. (ii) $\rho(0,t)\Delta S\Delta_z = N(t)$ where Δ_z is the thickness of the boundary layer, *i.e.* the region above the substrate where the particles are available for deposition. $N(t)$ is the average number of particles in a volume $\Delta S \times \Delta_z$ in this boundary layer. The equation for N reads

$$\dot{N} = -J(0,t)\Delta S - p_d N(t) \qquad (1)$$

where p_d is the deposition rate. The term $-J(0,t)$ corresponds to the new particles brought to the boundary layer by the diffusion in the bulk.

For the adhesion-aggregation process, the particles are no longer considered as densities, but as individual entities that can deposit on any cell (i,j) of the substrate. Let δt be the time discretization and $p_d(i,j,t)$ the deposition rate on cell (i,j) at time t. For each cell, $p_d(i,j,t)N(t)\delta t$ is interpreted as the probability that a new platelet (respectively new albumin) deposits on that cell. The time step is chosen small enough so that this quantity is always smaller than 1. The total number

$m(t)$ of newly deposited particles on the entire substrate is therefore

$$m(t) = \sum_{ij} [\text{rand(i, j)} < p_d(i, j, t) N(t) \delta t], \qquad (2)$$

where rand(i, j) are random numbers uniformly distributed in $[0, 1[$. The term $p_d N(t)$ in eq. (1) is then computed as $m/(n^2 \delta t)$, *i.e.* the average number of deposited particles per cell and per time unit.

We explain below how the deposition rates $p_d(i, j, t)$ are implemented in the model. If a cell is already occupied by a platelet, a new platelet can only deposit on top, thus increasing the thickness of the aggregate. This rate is noted p_{top} and is constant over time. If a cell is not occupied by a platelet, a new one can deposit. But the deposition rate depends on the amount of albumin already in this cell. It also differs for AP and NAP. The latter can only deposit in a cell next to an existing aggregate. Al can only deposit in a cell not occupied by a platelet.

More precisely, the deposition rules are the following. An albumin that reaches the substrate at time t will deposit with a probability $P(t)$ which depends on the local density $\rho_{al}(t)$ of already deposited Al. We assume here that P is proportional to the remaining free space in the cell, $P(t) = p_{al}(\rho_{max} - \rho_{al}(t))$, where p_{al} is a parameter and ρ_{max} is determined by the relative size of an albumin and the size of a cell. We considered that 100,000 albumin particles can fit in the area ΔS.

An activated platelet that hits a platelet-free cell on S will deposit with a probability Q, where Q decreases as the local concentration ρ_{al} of albumin already present increases. We assumed that $Q = p_{adh} \exp(-\lambda \rho_{al})$, where p_{adh} and λ are parameters. This expression can be justified from the fact that a platelet needs more free space than an albumin to attach to the substrate, due to their size difference. As more albumin occupy the deposition substrate, the probability to have enough space for the platelet decreases roughly exponentially. This can be checked with a simple deposition model on a grid, where small and large objects compete for deposition.

Once an activated platelet has deposited, it is the seed of a new cluster that will further grow due to the aggregation of other platelets. In our model, NAP can deposit next to already deposited platelets. The aggregation probability R is assumed to be $R = p_{agg} \exp(-\lambda \rho_{al})$, with p_{agg} another parameter.

The above model can be simulated numerically with different values of the unknown parameters (p_{al}, p_{adh}, λ, p_{agg} and p_{top}), in order to reproduce the time evolution of the *in-vitro* experiment, namely the number $N_c(t)$ of clusters per mm^2, the average cluster size $s(t)$ and the number $N_p(t)$ of platelets still in suspension (activated and non-activated).

However, the shear-induced diffusion coefficient D and the thickness of the boundary layer Δ_z need to be determined. The value of D from the Zydney-Colton theory (see e.g [6, 7, 9]) produces a flux of platelet towards the deposition substrate $D \approx 5 \times 10^{-11}\ m^2/s$ for the direction perpendicular to the flow, when considering $\dot{\gamma} = 100\ s^{-1}$ and a hematocrit of 40%. This value is too small to explain the 3125 platelets per $\mu\ell$ that have disappeared on average from the bulk within the first 20 s of the experiment, even with a high deposition rate. In a column of section $\Delta S = 5\ (\mu m)^2$ and height $L = 0.82\ mm$ (*i.e.* 4.1 $\mu\ell$), this amounts to about 12800 deosited platelets. To determine D we take the smallest value compatible with the observed depletion of platelet within the first 20 s, assuming that all platelet hitting the surface will adhere. To solve this problem we use a particle-based diffusion-deposition model. The experimentally determined number of particle in a column of section $\Delta S = 5\ (\mu m)^2$ and height $L = 0.82\ mm$ are randomly distributed in space. Then they are subject to a discrete time random walk: at every time step Δt each particle randomly changes its velocity to $\pm v$ and move accordingly. Particles that cross the line $z = 0$ are removed. Those reaching $z = L$ are bounced back from were they came. Using that $D = v^2 \Delta t/2$, we can chose Δt as a function of D and explore the deposition count after 20 s for different v and D, see Fig. 3. To match the experimental observation, assuming a perfect adsorption, the diffusion coefficient D needs to be $D \geq 1.2 \times 10^{-8}$. The published value $D \approx 5 \times 10^{-11}\ m^2/s$ for $\dot{\gamma} = 100\ s^{-1}$ and hematocrit of 40% is clearly too small to explained the observed deposition rate, whatever v is. In what follows we chose $D = 1.3\ 10^{-8}\ m^2/s$, corresponding to the molecular velocity $v = 3 \times 10^{-4}\ m/s$, as obtained from a fully resolved simulation of platelets and red blood cells in a shear rate of 100 s^{-1} and hematocrit of 40 % [10]. This discrete time random-walk model can also be used to determine Δ_z, the thickness of boundary layer that is needed for a continuous description of the diffusion-deposition process. Numerical investigations show that $\Delta_z = 2\ 10^{-5}\ m$ produces a good agreement between the



FIG. 3. Number of particles adsorbed after 20 s, in the random walk model.

p_{adh} $[s^{-1}]$	p_{agg} $[s^{-1}]$	p_{al} $[s^{-1}]$	p_{top} $[s^{-1}]$	λ $[(\mu m)^2]$
110	14.6	1.7×10^{-3}	0.6	30

TABLE I. The parameters of the model found to provide the best fit of the experimental data (see Fig. 4).

.

continuous and discrete models.

The full model for adhesion and aggregation of platelets, including the presence of albumin, has been run for 5 min of physical time, with $D = 1.3\ 10^{-8}\ m^2/s$ and $\Delta_z = 2\ 10^{-5}\ m$. We checked the independence of the result with respect to spatial and temporal discretization of the 1D diffusion models, which is not obeyed if the boundary layer Δ_z is omitted.

The value of p_{al}, p_{adh}, λ, p_{agg} and p_{top} that give the best agreement with experimental observation have been obtained by exploring the parameter space (see table I. The high value of p_{adh} suggests that the adhesion is diffusion-limited, whereas aggregation is reaction-limited. Figure 1 (right) shows the simulated deposition pattern after 5 min. Fig. 4 shows that our model reproduces quantitatively the *in-vitro* measurements, thus confirming the proposed scenario of deposition and aggregation, and the competition with albumin. Note that the values in Table I are expected to depend on the shear rate $\dot{\gamma}$ and the nature of the substrate.

To further test the model against the experiment, we compared the distribution of sizes s and volumes of the clusters measured by digital holographic microscopy (see Fig. 5). The size distribution from the simulation matches very well that of the experiment, at 20 s (data not shown) and at 300 s. The log-log plot suggests a power law distribution $p(s,t) = \alpha(t)s^{-\beta(t)}$, with $\beta(20s) = 2.23$ and $\beta(300s) = 1.84$. The simulation gives the distribution of the number of particles per clusters, including those that piled up along the z-axis. To compare this distribution with the experimental one, one needs to assign a volume to each platelet. Observations with the holographic microscope [8] indicate that the average volume of a platelet in suspension (6 $(\mu m)^3$) is too large since the platelets lose a significant part of its volume while depositing. Using a volume per platelet of $V_p = 0.28\ (\mu m)^3$ with the simulation data makes the volume distribution compatible with the *in-vitro* measurements (see Fig. 5 (right)). This value of V_p is compatible with the meaurement of the total volume of the deposited aggregates, found experimentally to be $V_{tot} = 1'701272\ (\mu m)^3$, and the total number of deposited platelets, $N_{tot} = 6,032,000$.

This study has revealed new phenomena in the adhesion-aggregation processes of platelets, namely the competition with albumin and the different roles played by activated and non-activated platelets. By adhesion, activated platelets initiate a new cluster which mostly grows due to the non-activated platelets. We have also analyzed the 3D structures of the aggregates and obtained the distribution of areas and volumes. By tuning the model parameters so as to fit the *in-vitro* time observations, the adhesion and aggregation rates can be measured. The excellent agreement between the model and the experiment gives a strong credit to the plausibility of the scenario we have considered. Our study has also revealed that the Zydney-Colton shear induced diffusion coefficient is significantly too small to explain the observed deposition rate. It seems that other researchers have already experienced a similar problem [11].



FIG. 4. The result of the adhesion and aggregation model (continuous and dashed lines) and the experimental data (points).



FIG. 5. *Left:* Distribution of the size of clusters at $t = 300\ s$. The area is given in $(\mu m)^2$. *Right:* Distribution of cluster volumes at $t = 300\ s$. The data suggest a power law with exponent -2.8. Simulation parameters are given in table I.

We acknowledge support from the European FP7-VPH THROMBUS project and from CADMOS.

* Bastien.Chopard@unige.ch

[1] B. Savage, E. Saldivar, and Z. Ruggeri, Cell **84**, 289 (1996).
[2] B. Savage, F. Almus-Jacobs, and Z. Ruggeri, Cell **94**, 657 (1998).
[3] J. M. M, E. Westein, W. Nesbitt, S. Giuliano, S. Dopheide, and S. Jackson, Blood **109**, 566 (2007).
[4] S. Shenkman, Y. Einav, O. Salomon, D. Varon, and N. Savion, Platelets **19**, 440 (2008).
[5] Supplementary material.
[6] A. Tokarev, A. Butylin, and F. Atauliakhanov, Biophysical J. **100**, 799 (2011).
[7] K. Affeld, L. Goubergrits, N. Watanabe, and U. Kertzscher, Journal of Biomechanics **46**, 430 (2013), special Issue: Biofluid Mechanics.
[8] K. Z. Boudejltia, D. R. de Sousa, P. Uzureau, C. Yourassowsky, D. Perez-Morga, G. Courbebaisse, B. Chopard, and F. Dubois, Biomedical Optics Express **6**, 3556 (2015).
[9] M. Mehrabadi, D. N. Ku, and C. K. Aidun, Annals of Biomedical Engineering , 14101421 (2015).
[10] L. Mountrakis, University of Amsterdam, private communication (2015).
[11] C. Aidun, Georgia Institute of Technology, private communication (2015).